APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,942	07/31/2003	Asaf Atzmon	6287P008	4966

8791   7590   12/23/2008
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
BANTAMOI, ANTHONY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2423	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 September 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As best as the Examiner can understand, Applicant is arguing that Fritsch fail to address each and every limitation recited in claim 1 and 27, therefore claims 1 and 27 and their dependent claims are deemed allowable.

With respect to claim 1, Examiner maintains that Fritsch teaches a method for multicasting an event of interest (figure 5, labels 502 (teaches receiving, unicast data packets)), further Fritsch teaches detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream (figure 5, label 520 (a instant replay request meets "event of interest ")), Fritsch teaches receiving a pause request (figure 6A, label 610) and removing the event creator from the group (figure 6A, label 612), upon receiving a go live event (figure 6B, label 618) the program is once again multicast to the group of requesters (figure 6B, label 622) which meets " multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest" as recited in claim 1.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons, since claim 27 is the system that performs the method of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 17-19, 23-24, 27-31, 34, 36, 43-45, and 49-50 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fritsch US Patent Publication

2002/0124258 (hereafter referenced as Fritsch).

Regarding claim 1, Fritsch discloses a method of receiving multicast data

packets 502 and detecting an instant replay request 520 within the multicast data

packets which reads on "detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a

received media stream; and multicasting at least one media stream of interest that

comprises the event of interest" (Figure 5).

Regarding claim 2, Fritsch discloses receiving program content 602 and

multicasting data packets to requesting subscribers 606 which reads on "the method

further comprising multicasting the received media stream" (figure 6A).

Regarding claim 3, Fritsch discloses storing received program packets to a

temporary buffer 608 which reads on "the method further comprising temporarily storing

the received media stream" (Figure 6A).

Regarding claim 4, Fritsch discloses multicasting the data packets to requesting

subscribers 606 simultaneously with the buffering process 608 which reads on "the

method further comprising multicasting the received media stream substantially in

parallel with said temporarily storing" (Figure 6A).

Regarding claim 5, Fritsch discloses a method of analyzing a pause request from

user wherein the decision step, 504 determines whether a pause has been requested

and if so recording step, 506 records the attributes of the event before sending the

request to the server for execution which reads on "the method wherein the step of

detecting comprises analyzing the received media to check a compliance of a received media stream segment with an event detection criterion" (Figure 5).

Regarding claim 8, Fritsch discloses detecting an instant replay request 624 setting the replay point 628 and unicasting program from replay point to user 630 which reads on "the method wherein the step of detecting comprises monitoring instant replay requests associated with a certain media stream, said requests being generated within a predefined time window" (Figure 6B).

Regarding claim 10, Fritsch discloses converting media data program content into packets 604 which reads on "the method wherein the step of detecting comprises image processing of the received media stream" (Figure 6A).

Regarding claim 17, Fritsch discloses media events such as pause 504, resume 512 within a multicast media stream which reads on "the method wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that occurred during a predefined period" (Figure 5).

Regarding claim 18, Fritsch discloses media events such as pause 504, resume 512 within a multicast media stream which reads on "the method wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that are associated with a certain channel or program" (Figure 5).

Regarding claim 19, Fritsch discloses media events such as pause 504, resume 512 within a multicast media stream wherein the pause resume or instant replay are request type events which reads on "the method wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest of a certain type" (Figure 5).

Regarding claim 23, Fritsch discloses removing subscriber from among the multicast receivers to avoid receiving additional multicast after a pause event has occurred which reads on "the method further comprising a step of preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest" (Figure 6A, 612).

Regarding claim 24, Fritsch discloses removing subscriber from among the multicast receivers to avoid receiving additional multicast after a pause event has occurred which reads on "the method further comprising a step of switching a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest" (Figure 6A, 612).

Claim 27, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of receiving multicast data packets (Figure 5, 502) and detecting an instant replay request (Figure 5, 520) within the multicast data packets which reads on "means for detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and means for multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest" (Figure 4, 402, 404).

Regarding claim 28, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of receiving program content (Figure 6, 602) and multicasting data packets to requesting subscribers (Figure 6, 606) which reads on "the system further adapted to multicast the received media stream" (figure 4, 402 and Figure 3A, 313).

Regarding claim 29, Fritsch discloses a system for storing received program packets to a temporary buffer (Figure 6, 608) which reads on "the system further comprising means for temporarily storing the received media stream" (Figure 3, 314).

Regarding claim 30, Fritsch discloses a system for multicasting the data packets to requesting subscribers (Figure 6, 606) simultaneously buffering the data packets (Figure 6, 608) which reads on "the system further adapted to multicast the received media stream substantially in parallel with said temporarily storing" (Figure 3, 313, 314).

Regarding claim 31, Fritsch is discloses a system that performs the method of analyzing a pause request from user (Figure 5, 504) wherein the decision maker step (Figure 5, 504) determines whether a pause has been requested and if so step(Figure 5, 506) records the attributes of the pause event and sends the request to the server for execution which reads on "the system wherein the detecting means analyze the received media to check a compliance of a received media stream segment with an event detection criterion" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 34, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of detecting an instant replay request (Figure 6, 624) setting the replay point (Figure 6, 628) and unicasting program from replay point to user (Figure 6, 630) which reads on "the system wherein the detection means are monitor instant replay requests associated with a certain media stream, said requests being generated within a predefined time window" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 36, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method converting media data program content into packets (Figure 6, 604) which reads on "the

system wherein the detection means image process the received media stream to detect an event of interest" (Figure 3, 306).

Regarding claim 43, Fritsch discloses a system that performs operations of media events such as pause (Figure 5, 504), resume (Figure 5, 512) within a multicast media stream which reads on "the system wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that occurred during a predefined period" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 44, Fritsch discloses a system that performs operations of media events media events such as pause (Figure 5, 504), resume (Figure 5, 512) within a multicast media stream which reads on "the system wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that are associated with a certain channel or program" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 45, Fritsch discloses a system that performs operations of media events such as pause (Figure 5, 504), resume (Figure 5, 512) within a multicast media stream wherein the pause resume or instant replay are request type events initiated by user which reads on "the system wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest of a certain type" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 49, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of removing subscriber from a group of multicast receivers to avoid receiving additional multicast after a pause event has occurred (Figure 6A, 612) which reads on "the system further adapted to prevent additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest" (Figure 3A).

Regarding claim 50, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of removing subscriber from a group of multicast receivers to prevent them from receiving redundant multicast after an event of interest has occurred (Figure 6A, 612) which reads on "the system further adapted to switch a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest" (Figure 3A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 6-7, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch in view of Lee et al US Patent 6,414,914 (hereafter referenced as Lee).

Regarding claim 6, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of noise signal exceeds a threshold. Lee discloses identifying and selecting scenes or sounds of interest in a media stream using audio cues and signal level threshold which reads on "the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of noise signal exceeds a threshold" (Figure 1A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lee in order to automatically select scenes or sounds of recorded media for replay.

Regarding claim 7, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of audio signal within predefined frequency. Lee discloses analyzing audio track to determine the audio levels within a set of frequency ranges of interest which reads on "the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of audio signal within predefined frequency" (Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lee in order to automatically select scenes or sounds of recorded media for replay.

Regarding claim 32, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of noise signal exceeds a threshold. Lee discloses identifying and selecting scenes or sounds of interest in a media stream using audio cues and signal level threshold which reads on "the system wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of noise signal exceeds a threshold" (Figure 1A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lee in order to automatically select scenes or sounds of recorded media for replay.

Regarding claim 33, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of audio signal within predefined frequency. Lee discloses analyzing audio track to determine the audio levels within a set of frequency ranges of interest which reads on "the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of audio signal within predefined frequency" (Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lee in order to automatically select scenes or sounds of recorded media for replay.

6.   Claims 9, 20, 35, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch in view of Gordon et al US Patent 6,253,375 (hereafter referenced as Gordon).

Regarding claim 9, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the step of detecting comprises monitoring media distribution resource allocation. Gordon discloses a system that performs the method of allocating channel resources to subscribers based predicated subscriber requests which read on "the method wherein the step of detecting comprises monitoring media distribution resource allocation" (Column 13, 37-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gordon in order to provide an interactive program distribution system.

Regarding claim 20, Fritsch is silent about the method further comprising a step of updating media streams of interest according to update parameters. Gordon discloses allocation of media resources based on subscriber resource usage wherein updates of sessions occur if events are paused for about two minutes which read on "the method further comprising a step of updating media streams of interest according to update parameters" (column 13, 39-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gordon in order to provide an interactive program distribution system.

Regarding claim 35, Fritsch is silent about the system wherein the detection means monitor media distribution resource allocation. Gordon discloses a system that performs the allocation of channel resources to subscribers based on predicated subscriber requests which read on "the system wherein the detection means monitor media distribution resource allocation" (Column 13, 37-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gordon in order to provide an interactive program distribution system.

Regarding claim 46, Fritsch is silent about the system further comprising means for updating media streams of interest according to update parameters. Gordon discloses a system which allocates media resources based on subscriber resource usage wherein updates of sessions occur if events are paused for about two minutes which read on "the system further comprising means for updating media streams of interest according to update parameters" (column 13, 39-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gordon in order to provide an interactive program distribution system.

7.   Claims 11-13, 15, 21-22, 25, 37-39, 41, 47-48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch in view of Gorbatov et al US Patent 6,792,617 (hereafter referenced as Gorbatov).

Regarding claim 11, Fritsch is silent about the method further comprising a step of notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest. Gorbatov discloses

alerting user of the occurrence of an event of interest which read on "the method further comprising a step of notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest" (Figure 2, 64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 12, Fritsch discloses displaying the pause symbol on the screen which reads on "the method wherein the step of notifying comprising displaying at least one symbol" (Figure 5, 510).

Regarding claim 13, Fritsch discloses displaying the pause symbol on the screen to alert user of a pause event which reads on "the method wherein the step of notifying comprises displaying at least one image representative of the event of interest" (Figure 5, 510).

Regarding claim 15, Fritsch discloses converting media data program content into packets 604 which reads on "the method wherein the method comprises converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder" (Figure 6A).

Regarding claim 21, Fritsch is silent about the method further comprising a step of updating a media stream of interest in response to client feedback. Gorbatov discloses changing a channel due to a user response to an event of interest which reads on "the method wherein the sequence of images is displayed at a client device in

addition to another media stream" (Figure 2, 64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 22, Fritsch is silent about the method further comprising a step of updating a media stream of interest in response to client actions. Gorbatov discloses changing a channel due to a user response to an event of interest which reads on "the method further comprising a step of updating a media stream of interest in response to client actions" (Figure 2, 64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 25, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein the client is notified about an event of interest according to notification rules, whereas at least one notification rule is defined by the client. Gorbatov discloses recording only programs where a match is found between the event notification and the registered event which reads on "the method wherein the client is notified about an event of interest according to notification rules, whereas at least one notification rule is defined by the client" (Column 10, 8-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 37, Fritsch is silent about the system further comprising means for notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest. Gorbatov discloses alerting user of the occurrence of an event of interest (Figure 2, 64) which read on "the

system further comprising means for notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest" (Figure 1, 26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 38, Fritsch discloses a system for performing the method of displaying a pause symbol on the screen (Figure 5, 510) after a pause request by user which reads on "the system wherein the client is notified by a display of at least one symbol" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 39, Fritsch discloses a system for performing the method of displaying the pause symbol on the screen to alert user of a pause event (Figure 5, 510) which reads on "the system wherein the client is notified by a display of at least one image representative of the event of interest" (Figure 4, 404).

Regarding claim 41, Fritsch discloses a system that performs the method of converting media data program content into packets (Figure 6, 604) for display which reads on "the system wherein the system further comprises means for converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and whereas the means for notifying are operable to notify a client by a display of a sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder" (Figure 3, 306).

Regarding claim 47, Fritsch is silent about the system wherein the updating means are responsive to client feedback. Gorbatov discloses a system that performs the method of updating a channel due to a user response to an event notification

(Figure 2, 64) which reads on "the system wherein the updating means are responsive to client feedback" (Figure 1, 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 48, Fritsch is silent about the system wherein the updating means are responsive to client feedback. Gorbatov discloses a system that performs the method of updating a channel due to a user response to an event notification (Figure 2, 64) which reads on "the system wherein the updating means are responsive to client actions" (Figure 1, 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

Regarding claim 51, Fritsch is silent about the system capable of notifying a client about an event of interest according to notification rules, whereas at least one notification rule is defined by the client. Gorbatov discloses recording only programs where a match is found between the event notification and the registered event which reads on "the system capable of notifying a client about an event of interest according to notification rules, whereas at least one notification rule is defined by the client" (Column 10, 8-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Gorbatov in order to provide a controlled program recording.

8.   Claims 14, 16, 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch in view of Gorbatov and further in view of Barton et al US Patent Publication 2005/0216942 (hereafter referenced as Barton).

Regarding claim 14, Fritsch and Garbatov are silent about the method wherein the step of notifying comprises sending to the client information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest. Barton discloses a screen capture of accessible multimedia data from server that user can tune to which read on "the method wherein the step of notifying comprises sending to the client information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest" (Figure 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Barton in order to provide user with enhanced control over multicast media.

Regarding claim 16, Fritsch and Garbatov are silent about the method wherein the sequence of images is displayed at a client device in addition to another media stream. Barton discloses a screen capture of image and a time bar which read on "the method wherein the sequence of images is displayed at a client device in addition to another media stream" (Figure 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Barton in order to provide user with enhanced control over multicast media.

Regarding claim 40, Fritsch and Garbatov are silent about the system wherein notification means send to client's information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest. Barton discloses a screen capture of accessible

multimedia data from server that user can tune to which read on "the system wherein notification means send to clients information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest" (Figure 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Barton in order to provide user with enhanced control over multicast media.

Regarding claim 42, Fritsch and Garbatov are silent about the system wherein the sequence of images is displayed in addition to another media stream. Barton discloses a screen capture of image and a time bar which read on "the system wherein the sequence of images is displayed in addition to another media stream" (Figure 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Barton in order to provide user with enhanced control over multicast media.

9.   Claims 26 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch in view of Lawler et al US Patent 5,699,107 (hereafter referenced as Lawler).

Regarding claim 26, Fritsch is silent about the method wherein a client receives a first media stream and is notified about an event of interest that occurred in a second media stream. Lawler discloses a reminder system that performs the method of reminding user about a event that is about to occur other than what the user is viewing which reads on "the method wherein a client receives a first media stream and is notified about an event of interest that occurred in a second media stream" (Figure 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lawler in order to allow user to quickly select desired future programs.

Regarding claim 52, Fritsch is silent about the system capable of notifying a client about an event of interest that occurred in a media stream other than the media stream to which the client device is tuned to. Lawler discloses a reminder system that reminds user about a event that is about to occur other than what the user is viewing which reads on "the system capable of notifying a client about an event of interest that occurred in a media stream other than the media stream to which the client device is tuned to" (Figure 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fritsch as taught by Lawler in order to allow user to quickly select desired future programs.

Conclusion

10.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY BANTAMOI whose telephone number is (571)270-3581. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272 7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Bantamoi
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

/Anthony Bantamoi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2623

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423